· PORT

DPS-3942 Copy / of 5

10 September 1958

## MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT:

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

Negotiation of Final Contract Price for Contracts Nos. FL-3011 and FM-3050, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, Baltimore, Maryland

1. A meeting was held at Westinghouse Electric Corporation, Baltimore, Md., on 21 August 1958 for the purpose of negotiation of the final contract price for Contracts Nos. FL-3011 and FM-3050. The following personnel were in attendance:

Westinghouse - Sales Engineer Supervisor Redetermination Section, Contract Admin. - Westinghouse - Accounting Manager Westinghouse - Supervisor Termination Section Air Force Auditor Air Force Auditor Project Contracting Officer - Contract Negotiator

- 2. Appendix I of Contract No. FL-3011 covered Project CHALICE, and Air Force requirements for APQ-56 Radar equipment, spares and related items. Appendix II covered field maintenance for Project CHALICE. Contract No. FM-3050 covered domestic and overseas field maintenance of APQ-56 Radar equipment for Project
- 3. On 12 and 13 August 1957 a final price was negotiated for Items 1 through 9A less Item 7 of Appendix I of FL-3011. The fixed amount was \$1,593,911.00 and is documented in

Amendment No. 8 and a Memorandum for the Record dated 26 August 1957 (SAPC-18843). 25X1

CLUJI)

- 4. Listed on Exhibit A, attached, is the total contract consideration for FL-3011, i.e., \$4,625,381.00. Also, the Contractor's original claim which included estimates to complete except the termination proposals which covered their interim claim for partial termination of Items 10 and 12. Based upon the Contractor's original claims an audit was performed and the results thereof were forwarded to the Contractor. The Contractor never submitted a reply regarding the questioned costs. The Air Force Auditor reaudited the Contractor's records in July 1958 as the Contractor desired to present the actual manufacturing costs. The Company never amended their original claim as they felt their accounting records adequately reflected their costs.
- 5. Listed below is the total contract consideration for FM-3050, i.e., \$67,384. Also, the Contractor's original claim and the results of the second audit conducted in July 1958 and the amount tentatively approved by the Contracting Officer. The Contracting Officer never made a firm offer to the Contractor other than \$67,384, the contract amount. The Contracting Officer advised the Contractor that if funds were available consideration to the overage would be given.

Item No.  1. Technicians Profit (7%) Sub-total	Contract Amount \$62,884	Contractor's Original Claim 78,505 5,495 84,000	Final Audit Approved Costs Only 76,242	Amount Questioned 2,263 5,495 7,758	Amount Allowed by Contracting Officer 76,905 5,383 82,288
2. Travel at cost TOTAL OVERAGE	4,500 \$67,384	2,187 \$86,187 \$18,803	2,187 \$78,429	\$7,758	2,187 \$84,475 \$17,091

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

6. The meeting opened with only representing the Company. They indicated that settlement of the termination claims would be handled by their The Contracting Officer indicated that an agreed upon final consideration was contingent upon property accountability, residual credits and verification of deliveries. kept insisting that since their books reflected their costs that the Contracting Officer should make an offer. The Contracting Officer indicated that the Company had never formally revised their claim and therefore they should indicate their final claim. A review by the Contracting Officer of the intent of mutual understanding and trust in connection with this contract and the Project was given as approach to this settlement was to put it mildlyn "very antagonistic". The Company then agreed to indicate their final manufacturing costs exclusive of G&A and Royalty on FL-3011.

- 2 -

EGGT

25X1

7. Based on this information and due to the insistance the Contracting Officer made an offer of \$2,500,000 of exclusive of the termination settlement. counteroffered with \$2,600,000 which was unacceptable to the Contracting Officer. The Contractor's original total claim was \$2,899,878 less \$90,896 for termination and \$4,423 for travel, making a net claim of \$2,808,982 or a base for the above. Of this, \$2,808,982, there was \$137,634 in manufacturing costs which the Auditor indicated in his report was never incurred. By applying the 17% G&A and 7% fee as claimed by the Contractor to the unincurred costs of \$137,634 the resulting total claim would amount to \$2,636,678. This results in a concession of \$36,678 in G&A when Mr. made an offer of \$2,600,000. From this \$36,678 is deducted \$3,655 which represents an amount for additional spares under Item 15 or a net concession of \$33,023. The Auditor had taken \$107,976 in exceptions in the G&A claim. This \$107,976 minus the net concession of \$33,023 results in a total of \$74,953. Company's offer of \$2,600,000 less the approved audited costs with 7% profit or \$2,531,981 results in a difference of \$68,019. Based on this information. the Contracting Officer made a second offer of \$2,550,000. asked to be excused in order to consider this offer. then joined the meeting for the purpose of settling the termination claim. Based on audited costs and the application of 7% profit and settlement expenses the amount of \$61,540 and \$25,122 for Items 10 and 12 respectively or a total of \$86,662 was allowable for this claim versus the Contractor's claim of \$90,896. The Contractor had withdrawn 8 crystals from the inventory and diverted to other work. It was agreed that the Contractor should pay for these crystals. Therefore, a G&A of 16% and 7% profit was applied or a total of \$719 as the cost to the Contractor for the crystals. This was deducted from the total allowable figure of \$86.662 or a net of \$85,943. Contracting Officer then made an offer of \$60.507 for Item 10 and \$25,115 for Item 12 or a total of \$85,622. accepted a settlement of an even \$85,000 with the understanding that Westinghouse would retain the crystals. This was acceptable to the Contracting Officer. 9. rejoined the meeting and settlement of FM-3050 was discussed. As was noted in Paragraph 5 above, there was an overrun claim of \$18,803. The Contracting Officer informed Mr. that the contract amount of \$67,384 was as high as he could commit himself until he knew whether funds were available to cover any agreed upon overrun. was asked to explain the overrun. This, he felt, was unnecessary and that if funds were available

Selencia S

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

then without a doubt their \$84,000 claim exclusive of travel should be allowed.

agreed to determine the reason for the overrun. This has been done and is the subject of his letter dated 27 August 1958 (DPS-3981) which discloses 1832 additional hours of services rendered. This will be submitted to

for consideration. If acceptable, and if funds are available either under FL-3011 or by transfer then based on the audit report an amount of \$82,288 for services and \$2,187 for travel or a total of \$84,475 would be allowed or an \$17,091 overage.

then made an offer to settle FL-3011, the 10. Mr. terminations and FM-3050 for the sum of \$2,729,000 including royalties but excluding travel costs. indicated that he could not accept this figure due to the possibility that funds for the FM-3050 would not be available. Mr advised that availability of funds would be checked and if the overage could be covered then the \$2,729,000 would be acceptable subject to the property audit report, residual credits if any, and delivery verification. Mr. | was very surprised that there would be such a stipulation even though he had been syprised of this matter several times during the day. He also stated that there definitely should not be an adjustment of price for residual property. His contention being that this was a fixed price contract, therefore, remaining residual was the property of Westinghouse. The Contracting Officer again reviewed the original negotiations in which the Project representatives understood that the contract would be handled as a CPFF but written as a fixed price, price redeterminable in order to effect a more flexible and speedier contractual arrangestated their Management originally agreed to collect costs on a CPFF basis but that property would not be maintained in a CPFF manner but would be handled as though the contract were fixed price. in the interest of good relationship and in keeping with his understanding of the Project, agreed that residual property would belong to the Government and that their records would be available for property audit. The Company was advised that an Auditor would be available about 15 September 1958. Mr. stated that if we sent an Amendment wherein it stipulated that the price was contingent upon specified conditions that it would not be accepted and that the Amendment would be returned unsigned.

11. The \$2,729,000 is considered a fair and reasonable settlement and would be allocated as follows:

```
$2,729,000

82,288 - For FM-3050, excludes travel

2,646,712

85,000 - For termination - Items 10 & 12 under

FL-3011

2,561,712

14,197 - For Royalty - FL-3011

2,547,515 - For equipment and services - FL-3011

excludes travel
```

Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/01/10: CIA-RDP89B00709R000400870012-7

25X1

SECRET

Based on the audit report and costs which conceivably could be reinstated an amount of \$2,542,451 could be allowed. The proposed figure of \$2,547,515 is \$5,064 more than the allowable figure. Since the G&A rates have not been negotiated by DOD for the calendar years 1957 and 1958 the rates used by the Contracting Officer were those that the Auditor felt might be approved. Therefore, this \$5064 concession is in the G&A area and it is felt it is justifiable to concede.

12. Upon completion of the property audit negotiations to settle Contract FL-3011 and FM-3050 will be resumed.

Contract Negotiator

## ATTACHMENT

DPS/DCI:HL:pf
Distribution:

✓Orig - FL-3011, Price Redetermination Folder

2 - FM-3050 (Prop.Sec.)

3 - Finance

h\_ #

5 - Chrono

CONCUR:

25X1

25X1

Contracting Officer, DPS



Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/01/10 : CIA-RDP89B00709R000400870012-7

SINIT

## EXHIBIT A

Item No.		Contract Amount	Contractor's Original Claim	Final Audit Approved Costs Only	Amount Questioned	For Non- Acceptance
APPENDIX I						
1 thru 9A less 7 & 10 thru 15	Item 7 - FIXED PRICE - CEILING PRICE Profit (7%) Royalty Sub-total	\$1,593,911 2,511,089		\$1,593,911 See 1,948,178	Par. 3 in Memo 208,686 150,980 13,808	for Red.
16	CEILING PRICE Profit (7%) Royalty Sub-total	410,000	378,576(A) 26,500 389 \$ 405,465	348 <b>,</b> 282(A)	33,549 26,500 389	- 0 -
(A)	After submission of claim added scope i spares for Item 16 Cost Profit (7%)	•	3,255 229			
			3,484		229	
10 Partial Ter	mination Profit Sub-total		58,071 <u>3,959</u> 62,030	43,266	12,822 3,959	1,983
12 Partial Ter	mination Profit Sub-total		23,581 862 24,443	22,706	862	875
APPENDIX II						
Item l Ceil	ing Price Profit (7%) Sub-total	78,381	73,253 5,128 78,381	69,878	3,375 5,128	- 0 -
	seas differential &					
tran	sportation at actual	32,000	4,423	4,423	- 0 -	- 0 -

## Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2011/01/10 : CIA-RDP89B00709R000400870012-7

CECTE!

EXHIBIT A - (cont'd)

Item No.	Contract Amount	Contractor's Original Claim	Final Audit Approved Costs Only	Amount Questioned	For Non- Acceptance
TOTAL FIXED	\$1,593,911	\$1,593,911	\$1,593,911		
TOTAL	3,031,470	2,899,878	2,436,733	460,287	2,858
GRAND TOTAL	\$4,625,381	\$4,493,789	\$4,030,644	\$460,287	\$2,858